6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Church. In these protest movements on the folk level, demand for acceptance on equal terms in an all-human brotherhood of men was emphasized.

In the meantime, with the increasing technological, economic, and intellectual advance of the West, the Western pressures against the Czardom were intensified. In order to meet this challenge and withstand the threat, the Czardom, by the time of Peter the Great, embarked on a series of reforms aimed at Westernization of the Empire, such as secularization of the State, bureaucratization, industrialization and mass education. As a result of such developments, a new elite of parvenu salaried bureaucracy, and of parvenu salaried military, distinguished by the rank and not by the possession of land, was gradually taking the place of the old service nobility as the main pillar of the Czardom. At the same time, the old nobility who were freed of their obligatory service to the State, became hereditary owners of their estates.

In this manner, the old service nobility evolved into a class of economically independent landed squires, even though losing their former political status and privileges, such as monopoly on land and on service. This new gentry however, were by tradition, upbringing, and personal traits, interested in ruling, in political and military careers, not in land cultivation or industry. Many of them, when without office, tended to lead a life of leisure, and to emulate Western manners and styles, to cultivate arts and letters and to indulge in philosophical speculation and formulation of political theories. Few showed an inclination to identify themselves with the productive strata of the population and to devote time and energy to improve techniques of economic production and management.

Such an attitude of the nobility was an important agent in the retarded economic growth of Russia and in the lack of development of a numerically strong and influential middle class, which might have served as a cementing force in a culturally and ideologically split society. And it was from among this leisured class of rural gentry who had lost their status as the main pillar of the Czardom, but who had also emancipated themselves from their economic dependency upon the Czar, that the first

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

leaders of an organized opposition to the Czarist autocracy were recruited.

By the nineteenth century, this landed gentry opposition to the Czarist regime took two main forms. One was pro-Western, seeking the reconstruction of the Czardom along humanistic, libertarian and juridical lines, brought about by the ideas of Humanism and Renaissance, by the Reformation and by the French and American Revolutions. The other was anti-Western, reacting against Western rationalism and materialism, against Western "heathenism" and cosmopolitanism, and against the Western system of impersonal formalism and open class strife which was beginning to infiltrate Russia.

In an attempt to bridge the widening cultural and ideological chasm between the ruling classes and the common folk, the anti-Westerners exalted the anarchic community relations and equalitarian and humanist values of the Old-Slavonic world and of the Russian peasant commune. But they also emphasized the value of the Church-State unity, and sought a Messianic redemption of the whole world through the absorption of the State by the Orthodox Church and reestablishment of a paternalistic system of community relations ruled by collective conscience and based on Christian love and compassion.

In the meantime, that is, by the second part of the nineteenth century, with the growing impoverishment of the rural gentry and with increasing educational opportunities for all strata of the population, the ranks of the educated classes (*intelligentsia*) were being swollen by many declassed people as well as by increasing numbers of young people from the families of clergymen, of lower government employees, of petty tradesmen and other lower classes (*raznochintsy*). Even though Czardom at the time was still governmentalized to a high degree, it was not totally regimented. Moreover, by the second part of the nineteenth century, under the pressure of the West, and in order to match the military, the educational, the industrial and the social levels of the Western world, Czardom abolished serfdom and made other concessions in the direction of a libertarian and a juridical state. This trend of events reinforced the penetration of Western political and social philosophies which tended

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

[XIX century]

517 178 177 565

to undermine the existing Church, State and family system based on self-abnegation and on unconditional submission.

As a result, a number of raznochintsy intelligentsia, freed of fear and awe before God, the Czar and the Father, but feeling thwarted in their political ambitions and socially rejected, expressed their dissatisfaction and their hostility toward the existing conditions of inequality and oppression by developing ideologies of denial and destruction. Their aim was to reject and to annihilate all the basic institutions and authorities on which Czardom rested: the family, religion, property, the power of the Father, the authority of the Church, as well as the rule of the Czar. These revolutionaries denied God and conscience as well as any existing ethics or rules of conventional conduct. They sought to destroy Czardom "root and branch" and to seize power for themselves by all and any means. Their professed objective was to establish on the earth an all-human stateless society of totally free men living in a system of equalitarian justice and fraternal love.

517 668

Thus, while seeking to reestablish the anarchic and group-oriented values of the early Slav folk and of the Russian peasant commune, these revolutionaries exhibited also Messianic power-centered urges and destructive drives common in the ruling classes of Czardom. Hence a number of these people became professional conspirators, advocating establishment of an underground organization with rigidly centralized total power commanding expendability of its members, and demanding their complete dedication to the cause of the revolution. They considered this system of organization to be the only effective way to fight the Czarist rule. In this "mortal struggle," these dedicated young men and women tolerated no opposition or differences of opinion, propagated extreme hatred and pitilessness in dealing with all adversaries, organized assassinations, mutinies, strikes and mass risings, thus preparing the ground for the ascendancy of Bolshevism.

The Bolsheviks were a group of professional conspirators. In common with Messianic and power-oriented aims of all raznochintsy, the Bolsheviks endeavored to seize absolute and total power exclusively for themselves, by any and all means, as a way

1 [i.e. of undermining due to penetration of western influences -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ple, in the plains between the Drava and Sava rivers, showed cultural and personality traits similar to those of the Old-Slavonic plowmen.[20]

In their migration, these early Slav soil cultivators were often able to Slavicize the natives among whom they had settled and even to absorb the numerically small bands of steppe raiders who had conquered them. These assimilated invaders were then often employed to fight against new nomadic incursions.[21] It was in the course of such acculturations, due to migrations and conquests, that in the regions between the Volga and the Dnieper a peculiar fusion of contrasting cultural patterns of the steppe horsemen and of the tillers of the soil had developed. Structural relations, personality traits and the religious, social and political ideologies that resulted out of this blend of the two conflicting worlds formed the basis of Russian society and have been at the root of its political instability throughout centuries.[22]

4
TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND FORMATION OF RUSSIAN SOCIETY

I

THE MOUNTED warriors of the steppes were accustomed to covering great distances on their raids and migrations. After they had devastated and annihilated much that was in their way, they would impose their rule with ease over whatever was left. Then they would proceed to organize nomadic federations, principalities and empires.[1] The political systems which thus arose in the area between the Ural mountains and the Carpathians apparently followed the pattern that had been originally established by the Scythians and Huns in the same territory.[2]

Being extremely self-centered and insecure, a strong driving

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

In a similar manner the old Kiev Chronicle points out the cultural differences between a number of Slavic-speaking tribes, such as the Polians—the "field-people," and the Drevlians (Drevlyane)—the "inhabitants of the forests," in the middle Dnieper basin. While the former are described as peaceful and mild, organized along egalitarian lines, the latter are represented as ferocious and wild, organized along monarchial, predatory, warlike, and polygynic principles. The Drevlians, says the Chronicle, ". . . lived like beasts; friends killed one another (*ubivahu drug druga*) . . . no marriage took place amongst them, but they captured young girls on the banks of the rivers."[6] And as for some other tribes, such as the Radimichi, the Vyatichi, and the Sever, the Chronicle says that ". . . shameful things occurred amongst them between fathers and daughters-in-law . . . there was no marriage . . . but the villagers would get together for dancing and satanic games, and there they captured their wives . . . they had generally two or three wives . . . they burned their dead."[7]

It is to be expected that under such circumstances cultural dualism and internal conflict and tension occurred within many individual families in this area. A Slavonic woman as wife or concubine of a Turco-Mongol horse-breeder and warrior might know nothing about his nomadic and predatory way of life, about horses and mares, about weapons, wagons and tents. She might therefore introduce into her new family agricultural techniques and a more settled way of life.

Being raised in an equalitarian society with some matriarchal traits, and with emphasis on self-respect and personal autonomy, a Slavonic woman would not be inclined to be completely submissive to her Turco-Mongol husband. Following child rearing customs of her own society the Slavonic woman would tend to remain close to her children, would teach them Slavonic speech, and might even be in a position to give them protection from the arbitrariness and impulsiveness of their warlike father. Such a situation reinforced and even magnified the traditional distance between the Turco-Mongol father and the members of his family.

At the same time the invader would insist on a subordinate

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

623 626 [661] a fiction. Lacking means of physical enforcement because of the lack of a centralized political system, common action could take place only among those who voluntarily agreed. But when small bands of mounted warriors imposed their rule over the multitudes of non-warlike peasantry, the power-oriented conquerors made use of the Old-Slavonic system of unanimity for purposes of regimentation and governmentalization from above. That is, they imposed a dictated consensus by means of force else the opposition of the peasant majority would soon have deprived the ruling minority of its power.

634 [152] In this manner a number of band chieftains of nomadic origin ruled groupings of small peasant communities, in the form of manorial principalities. Each one of these local potentates, even though Slavicized in speech or born in mixed families, still exhibited extreme self-seeking characteristics and cherished personal power and aggrandizement above everything else, a tenet that had characterized his nomadic predecessors. Each, therefore, following steppe traditions, had a scheme of his own; each was interested primarily in accumulating riches for himself and his immediate family. In consequence, these local princes and their war bands constantly intrigued and fought among themselves. They also transferred their personal and factional strifes to the neighboring towns of burghers. In these squabbles and struggle for power and expansion, the feuding princes and fighting factions did not hesitate to call on the common enemies in their neighborhoods, such as the steppe marauders or the Viking pirates to come in and help them defeat their opponents.

[579] 628 It was in the course of such an internecine strife (*vsta rod na rod*) in Novgorod region in the middle of the ninth century that a band of Scandinavian merchant-pirates was called on to come and help one clique of native princes against the other.[18] These "Varangians" not only came in but stayed, founding later the Russian state in the Dnieper river basin, at that time the most important merchant thoroughfare in that part of the world. These Norse conquerors and state builders were soon assimilated by the natives. In the course of time a series of new principalities was formed and old factional bickerings and fratricidal warfare was renewed.[19]

[487] [177]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

over the whole earth.[1] Through the support of the Church the absolute power of the Emperor became sacred, all-comprising and omnipresent. In the proclamation which announced his reign after he has been solemnly anointed by the Patriarch it was stated that he "proceeded from God, and not from man," and that to him, the "supreme master of the universe, absolute obedience was due from all."[2]

It was this Messianic ideology of politico-religious proselytism and world salvation which had united the Church and the state that helped Byzantium to solidify its rule and to spread its influence and control over the neighboring countries. In conquered, dependent and friendly territories numerous bishoprics of Eastern rite were established whose function was to obtain the moral support of the people for the Byzantine ruler. The conquered people were allowed a certain degree of autonomy in their internal affairs and one of their privileges was the right of the use of their native language in church rituals.

This politico-religious expansionism, however, had its weaknesses. The only tie that linked the subjected and the dependent peoples with the central power was the Church. Thus, as soon as the central power and the authority of the Byzantine Emperor weakened as a result of internal feuds, palace revolutions, civil wars, and invasions, some petty local potentates saw a chance to emancipate themselves from Constantinople and proclaim themselves as sovereign rulers. Such a local lord following Byzantine traditions would appoint from his own kinsmen bishops and Patriarchs whose function was to anoint the new king, to bestow upon him God-like qualities, and to sanctify his despotic rule among the subjects.

It is this pattern of Church and state relations that also developed between Byzantium and Russia by the end of the tenth century, when as a result of a political alliance with Byzantium Prince Vladimir of Kiev was converted to Christianity.[3] A Greek Metropolitan and a number of Greek Orthodox bishops were subsequently sent to Russia. Having an eye on the control of all other Russian principalities, the Byzantine Church bestowed upon the Metropolitan of Kiev the authority over all Russian

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

II

Following Byzantine traditions and being entirely dependent upon and identified with the dominant political power, the Russian Orthodox clergy supported the autocratic reign of Muscovite rulers by means of an apotheosis of the Czar. According to this theocratic ideology the role of the Church was to be the loyal ally and helper of the Czar who derived his authority directly from God. The Czar's judgment could be overruled by no prelate. In his effort, common with that of the Church to establish a divine order on the whole earth, the Czar had to be unconditionally supported.[6]

Native Russian, Byzantine and Turco-Mongol institutions and concepts were blended in this system of Russian imperial theocracy. According to the Mongol idea of imperial power the emperor was the owner of the body and of the property of each one of his subjects. He was, however, disinterested in their souls and conscience. Thus, as far as religious beliefs were concerned, the Mongol rulers showed a great deal of tolerance; being interested mainly in collecting the tributes and not in governing they did not look at religion and clergy as allies in ruling. The shamans among the Ural-Altaic peoples were not organized as a priestly class and the Mongol emperor, even after he had accepted Islam, did not see any potential threat to his imperial power in any religion. In that system of power there was a complete separation of religion and politics.

In Byzantium, on the other hand, the Church was a powerful and well-organized force with imperial ambitions. But the Church was subdued to the imperial and personal interests of the lay ruler. The Church often succeeded, however, in using the imperial power for its own ends. At the same time the Byzantine Emperor in legal theory did not rule in his own right, but derived his authority from the people. In legal theory, he was an elected monarch and was subjected to the supreme rule of law, even if the law emanated from him. There was thus in Byzantium a well established set of laws which bound equally the Emperor and his subjects and guaranteed also certain rights to the subjects.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

177 642 The ideology of Moscow imperial theocracy was rooted in the power-centered traditions of Russian princes, reinforced by a fusion of Mongol and Byzantine political ideas and practices. As among the Mongols, the Czar was considered to be the supreme owner of the body and of the property of his subjects, but as among the Byzantines he was also concerned with their souls. At the same time, according to the Muscovite political philosophy, the Czar as owner of his subjects derived his authority not from the people, as in Byzantium, but directly and exclusively from God.[7] Therefore, the Czar alone possessed rights, his subjects only duties.

643

In the Muscovite system of theocratical power not only was the Czar's freedom unlimited by any laws, but his personal will was not limited by any recognized human rights either. The Czar was considered to be limited only by his duty to God and by Divine law. The Czar, however, was himself the sole judge of his duty to God. He himself was the sole interpreter of Divine Law in regard to temporal affairs. Even the head of the Church could only supplicate but not advise him in these matters. The Czar was therefore at liberty to use the law capriciously as an instrument of his personal power, or to break the law at his convenience. And so he often did.[8]

643 565 Supported by the imperial ambitions of the Church, Muscovite rulers had two main objectives. One was the solidification of the unlimited personal power of the Czar to which all institutions of law and order were subjected; the other consisted of territorial expansion at the expense of the neighboring countries. The hereditary magnates—the local princes and the boyars—were obstacles in the path of both of these objectives. This landed aristocracy, following the traditions of early Russian princes, insisted on their personal and manorial privileges and resented any interference of the Muscovite Czar. They were therefore in favor of limitation of the Czar's power.

565 [643] At the same time, however, these magnates were members of an advisory council to the Czar (*Boyarskaya Duma*); in this council some of them were closer to the Czar and formed an inner circle which exerted more power and influence on the affairs of the state. The boyars were therefore not unified and did not

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

his wife"; "The husband is the law unto his wife," the proverbs say. As a result of such a view of husband-wife relations, the husband had the right and duty to apply brutal force to his wife as a means of discipline, the same as to his children. "It is woman's fate to be always beaten," the people would say.[20]

The description of folk life in the eastern parts of Russia corroborate this attitude toward wives as expressed in popular sayings. The informants tell of the "miserable fate of the women" (*nepriglyadnaya uchast zheny*),[21] the constant fights of husband and wife (*muzh deretsya s zhenoi*), and the thrashing (*poboi*) to which the wives were exposed on the part of their husbands. In case of adultery the punishment for the woman was "merciless beating" (*neshchadnoe bitie*) or strangling (*udushenie*).[22]

Domostroy, which was under the influence of Church teachings, agrees with this philosophy and practices and even offers elaborate and detailed precepts to the husband about how to treat his wife ". . . if the wife is not afraid of the punishment and does not follow the instructions, the husband should beat her." According to Domostroy only if the wife is blindly and unconditionally submissive "everything will run smoothly in the family." The wife must do everything "to please her husband and God and she must listen to him with fear and awe."[23]

Domostroy was compiled primarily for the urban classes of the Czardom. Its rules reflect a certain deterioration in the status of women as they moved from the peasant to the urban level. In the cities, especially among the merchants, the women were confined to the *terem* (gyneceum) and had less opportunity to work and earn for themselves. In the urban environment, the Turco-Mongol influences were therefore reinforced.

In the rural areas the women retained their role in economic production. The peasant women were thus enabled to retain some of the the Old-Slavonic traditions; they often knew how to assert themselves and influence family affairs. In a like manner, with the increasing opportunities for schooling in urban centers, a growing number of city women emancipated themselves from family ties and became economically and socially independent. In such circumstances also many women in the urban

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Herzen]
[Sophia Perovskaya]

with all his fellow creatures . . . I felt intense pity for the old man, but I could do nothing—he was inaccessible.[2]

The liberalizing influences which were penetrating Russia from the West reinforced urges of revolt against despotism as well as feelings of identification with suffering masses. By the second part of the nineteenth century the reaction against the tyrannical family environment and oppressing political system took often an extreme form. It is common knowledge that many Russian terrorists and assassins of the second part of the nineteenth century grew up exposed to constant family tensions and personal humiliations, and sought total destruction of society. Others were inclined to identify themselves with all who were abused. Thus we find the urge for destruction and identification with suffering as fundamental aspects of the ideology of Russian revolutionary movements. For instance, Kropotkin, the outstanding Russian Anarchist directly related his revolutionary activities to his identification with all those who were persecuted. He appealed to all who were exposed to maltreatment to rise against their oppressors:

> Ay, all of us together, we who suffer and are insulted daily, we are a multitude whom no man can number. We are the ocean that can embrace and swallow up all else. When we have but the will to do it, that very moment will justice be done; that very instant the tyrants of the earth shall bite the dust.[3]

Or take, for instance, Sophia Perovskaya, one of the plotters in the assassination of Czar Alexander II. According to her biographers her father was a willful despot "such as the patriarchal system alone could have produced," and her mother, "constantly humiliated and insulted," remained at home to protect the children. Thus, in her own family Perovskaya learned to hate oppression and developed her love for the oppressed and weak. For her mother, one of the down-trodden, she had a love "bordering upon adoration."[4] Catherine Breshkovskaya, another outstanding Russian revolutionary, who became known as the "little grandmother of the Russian revolution," tells us in her reminiscences and letters how her childhood experiences affected her feelings, thoughts, and actions throughout her life:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

diffusionist" in their general approach. Thus a number of writers attribute the ambivalent traits in Russian behavior to the influence of climate. The struggle with hostile forces of nature, say these people, has developed in the Russian man qualities of tenacity, energy, and strength; but at the same time the insuperable forces of nature have developed qualities of patience, resignation, and meekness. The former has developed hardness of character by the very bitterness of the struggle; the latter has taught him to sympathize with the afflicted and desolate.[13]

Other geographic theories point out not only the extremes in climate, but the contrasting nature of the soil as well, as a means to explain Russian behavior and Russia's life and history which are full of contrasts and contradictions. Russia's forest and marshy area is contrasted to the steppe regions as the basic foundations on which Russian society has grown.[14]

There are other students of Russia who tend to explain unbalanced traits in the Russian man on the ground of conflicting Asiatic and European cultural influences, to which Russia has been subjected throughout many centuries of its formation. This view is still shared by many. It had been advanced by a number of Russian intellectuals, among them Leo Tolstoy:

> One *Rus* has its roots in a universal, or at least in European culture. In this *Rus* the ideas of goodness, honor and freedom are understood as in the West. But there is another *Rus:* the *Rus* of the dark forests, the *Rus* of the Taiga, the animal Russia, the fanatic Russia, the Mongol-Tartar Russia. This last Russia made despotism and fanaticism its ideal. . . . Kiev *Rus* was a part of Europe, Moscow long remained negation of Europe.[15]

It would be difficult however to explain ambivalence in the behavior of individuals and peoples exclusively on the basis of such generalized influences of East and West, extremes in climate, and contrasts between forests and steppes. The circumstances which become significant as agents in personality formation have to be felt directly or indirectly on a number of levels of interpersonal and institutional relationships. Among these one of the more effective influences which shape and mold the personality of man seems to be the family environment.

Some Russian intellectual leaders and men of letters, such as

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

former role as main instruments of the Czar's power to a parvenu bureaucracy and military that leaders of first opposition movements were recruited.

Even before and during the French Revolution a number of Russian landed nobility became aware of the ideas of the Revolution. They were also becoming increasingly interested in constitutional forms of government in which they could take part in their own right, not depending upon the whims of a despotic monarch. Some of these people even became dissatisfied with serfdom because of its economic inefficiency. They were also becoming increasingly impatient with absolutism because of its oppressive and degrading aspects.

Such ideas and feelings penetrated the officers' corps and a number of this military intelligentsia organized themselves into a secret society and formulated a concrete program for constitutional changes.[1] Some of these people came from high nobility. Others, especially those from the South, were impoverished nobles living on meager officer's salaries. In December, 1825 these people attempted to seize power. However, owing to ideological differences and the traditional factional splits within the dvorianstvo, the attempt of this faction of military intelligentsia to gain power was thwarted.[2] Nevertheless, this uprising of the "Decembrists," though abortive, was the beginning of increasing revolutionary activities of the intelligentsia[3] which finally brought about the overthrow of the Czardom in the Revolution of 1917.

The revolt of the Decembrists was a sign that the Czardom had already gone through such changes in its social structure that a change in its political system was overdue. The most important change in this structure was the formation of a class which, for the first time in Russia's history, became economically independent of the Czar, and which, though economically idle and not always prosperous, became intellectually very alert and also very sensitive to Western ideas.

In accordance with the traditional behavior pattern of Russian nobility, their reactions to the conditions at home and to Western thought tended to develop in the direction of two opposite extremes. One was that of the "Westerners" who were

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

inclined to take a defeatist attitude and who in their defeatism tended to acknowledge little in the achievements of Russia. They took a very negative attitude toward Russia's social and political system, demanded a break with Russia's past and wanted a thorough Westernization of the country.[4]

Another group of this landed gentry tended to idealize the values of the Old-Slavonic culture and those of the pre-Petrine, pre-bureaucratized, pre-secularized, and Holy Russia. These people, who were highly learned according to Western standards, were aware of many of the inadequacies and deficiencies of the Russia of their times. At the same time they feared the expansionistic designs of the West and the infiltration of Western thought, institutions and practices. They were extremely sensitive to the criticism of Russia and the Russian people prevalent in those days among Western scholars and other Western observers.

Apparently as a reaction to such a threat and criticisms, and perhaps also because seeking compensation for their wounded pride, these people resorted to a flight into Russia's past and projected an idealized image of former values of Russia and of Slav people into the future. They were inclined to criticize the political and social system which Peter the Great had introduced and in which he followed Western patterns; they demanded a return to pre-Petrine and Orthodox Russia reestablished in all its former glory. Such a visionary image of Russia enabled these well off landowning intelligentsia to see also themselves regaining the grandeur, the self-respect, the social prestige and the political power which they were rapidly losing to a parvenu military and bureaucratic hierarchy.

These people reacted aggressively against a challenging Western world by over-stressing what they thought were superior qualities of Slavs and superior values of Russian and Slav culture. It was in this manner that a romantic view of Slav folk society and of the Russian man was developed. These ideas left a strong imprint on literature, art, philosophy and political thinking both of the nineteenth and of the twentieth century Russia and became known as "Slavophilism."

Brought up in a patriarchal family system which had condi-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

tioned them to dominance-submission and protection-dependence relationships, but yearning also for the Old-Slavonic anarchic and egalitarian justice, the "Slavophils" tended to idealize especially those institutions in which paternalistic, as well as equalitarian, relationships were well established, but which they saw distintegrating in new circumstances. Such was, for instance, the *mir* institution, according to their view.

According to the Slavophil interpretation, the old Russian and Slav community was founded on the principles of obedience, mutual responsibility, social justice and equality, Christian love and humility.[5] They asserted that the Russian land commune was the foundation of an original and highly satisfactory culture which was exempt from the vices of the Western civilization, untainted with proletarianization, pauperism, and the problem of wages. The mir was an institution in which man felt as an organic and integral part of his community. There was no uncertainty, no insecurity, and no frustrations in that social system since in it the values were absolute and unchallenged.[6]

The Slavophils idealized Russia's patriarchal relationships based on absolute and unchallenged values, on faith and on total fusion of man and community, as contrasted to Western individualism, cosmopolitanism, rationalism and skepticism. They contended that reason, if separated from faith, introduces doubts, splits and conflicts between man and his society. They stressed the organic totality and harmony of the Old-Slavonic and pre-Petrine Russian society in contrast to the materialism and class strife of the West.[7]

The old pre-Petrine order which the Slavophils idealized had greatly depended upon Church support and religious sanction for its perpetuation. The Slavophils therefore feared that Western liberalism which was beginning to penetrate Russia would undermine its religious foundation. As a defense against such demoralizing influences, the Slavophils pointed out that the Western world was rapidly disintegrating because of the spreading of free thought and because of the decline of the faith. The West was a prey to Roman heathenism, they said, and it was from this traditional anti-Christian spirit that revolutions, free thought, the papacy, and the Reformation had sprung.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Pensa gubernia rose against the landlords with the slogan "Liberty and Land" (*Zemlya i Volya*).[4] Ever since they had been enserfed and bound to the land, the peasants kept in cherished memory the *Yuriev den*, St. George's day, the day when in earlier times each peasant was allowed to leave his landlord (*vykhod*). The peasants' demand for freedom from bondage was as strong as their demand for land. When the ideas of personal, economic and political freedoms started to penetrate Russia from the European West, also, the Russian peasants, owing to a growing contact with the city and the intelligentsia, became affected by them and in consequence revolts were increasing in number. Between 1826 and 1830 there were 41 cases of peasant rebellions and between 1858–1860 there were 284 such uprisings.[5]

It is significant to note that these peasant rebellions became especially prominent and especially widely spread each time the ruling class had suffered loss of prestige, such as in case of defeat on the battlefield. During the Crimean War in 1854 and 1855 widespread peasant uprisings took place on the shores of the Volga, and in central and southwestern gubernias, the Vladimir, Ryasan, Tambov, Pensa, and Voronezh.[6] In these provinces the mir institution prevailed and periodical redistribution of land was practiced. Here also reaction against abusive and humiliating conditions of serfdom was very intense and demand for land became very strong. In these provinces the traditions of earlier revolts were fresh in the memory of the peasantry. In addition, growing density of population and increasing land shortage tended to strengthen the revolutionary attitudes of the peasants. Their hostilities turned against the landlords whom they blamed for all their ills and misfortunes.

II

The defeat in the Crimean War and the internal disturbances which followed that war forced the Czarist government to undertake measures to reorganize its armed forces and to stabilize the regime internally. After being defeated by technologically and politically superior enemies, the Czarist government finally realized that in order to improve Russia's fighting effectiveness vis-a-vis the West, higher state revenues were needed and these

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

By the end of that century[1] a faction of Russian radical intelligentsia fused the Russian Narodnik and Anarchist ideologies and practices with those of Western Socialism and formed the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries. The program of this Party was agrarian socialism and terrorism. They published leaflets and manifestos, and spread their ideas in the villages. The Socialist Revolutionaries preached open violence as a means of overthrowing the Czarist regime. They relied on the peasantry to start uprisings against the landlords and government officials, and to commit individual acts of terror to achieve their ends. Just as earlier, the Anarchists and Terrorists, the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, had a separate organization which specialized in perpetrating acts of terror:

> Where the lash and the whip are, there are also the bomb and the revolver! So has it been, so is it now, and so shall it be. When public indignation and hate become centered upon an agent of the regime whether he be placed high or low; when that agent becomes a symbol of violence and despotism; when his activity becomes harmful to the commonweal; when no means are available to render him harmless and his continued existence represents an affront to the social conscience, then is the door open to terror in the executor of the sentence pressed from the hearts of public-minded citizens.[7]

The terroristic organization of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries enjoyed complete autonomy within the Party. It had its own sources of revenue and was independent in selection of prospective victims. In the course of a few years of its existence it perpetrated more than two hundred acts of terror. Most of these consisted of assassinations or of attempted assassinations of highly placed officials of the government, including a member of the Imperial Family, two Ministers of Interior, thirty-nine governors, seventy-four ranking officers of the army and the navy, and fifty-two high police officials. Seventy percent of these acts of terror were perpetrated by workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors.[8]

The Socialist Revolutionaries relied mainly on middle and poor peasant strata. They attempted to widen the gap between the better-off and the poor, to set up the lowest strata against the upper, to stir class hatred against the kulaks. In their manifestos, leaflets, and speeches, the Socialist Revolutionaries harangued

[1] [i.e. 19th century -- Analyst]

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

The landed gentry had for ages kept the peasants in slavery, misery and contempt. The peasants, feeling humiliated and wronged, had risen against the landlords, burning manorial mansions, looting estates, and massacring their masters whenever the power of the nobility appeared to be waning. Since the traditions of Russian landed squires were those of service nobility, not of manorial aristocrats, their interests and ambitions did not prepare them to take a personal interest in either their lands or serfs. The mansions on the estates of these rural gentry were located on the outskirts of the peasant villages and except for the house servants there was little if any contact with the world of the peasantry. Since Peter the Great the differences between these two worlds became also very visible in dress, manners, standard of living, as well as in views of life, education, ideas and morals. When, after the reforms of Peter the Great, French ways were aped by the dvorianstvo, and French language accepted by them as a means of social intercourse, the abyss between the two worlds became even more unbridgeable.

Similarly the bureaucracy and the revolutionary intelligentsia were two violently opposed camps with little possibility of cooperation between them. And while secondary schools and the universities were producing increasing numbers of lawyers, teachers, architects, journalists, artists, and literati, the tension between the bureaucracy and these intelligentsia developed into an intense and open enmity. Extreme emotionalism nursed on the family level was only heightened in such conditions. Each of these groups therefore showed a great deal of dogmatism; they tended to be implacable, irreconcilable, and full of malevolent criticism of each other. To the revolutionary intelligentsia the bureaucrats were the "corrupted lackeys of the dynasts to be killed like beasts." To the government officials all the liberal intelligentsia were the "mortal enemies" of the Czar. They represented the "sedition" and had to be "mercilessly annihilated."[12] Thus while the intelligentsia relentlessly attacked the bureaucracy in a spirit of destructive criticism, the bureaucracy responded by persecuting the liberals and the revolutionaries with such a blind passion and hatred that the opposition had to go underground or emigrate abroad and organize its war from out-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

They believe that politics is the business of the government, the business of the Central Committee, and as for the writers that their business is not to interest themselves in politics. They believe that if a man wrote well, artistically, and beautifully, one should let it go, in spite of the rotten passages which disorientate our youth and poison it. We demand that our comrades, both the supervisors of literature and the writers themselves must be guided by something without which the Soviet regime cannot exist, and that is politics. Lenin wrote: "Literature must become Party-minded . . . Against bourgeois literary careerism and individualism . . . socialist proletariat must put forward the principle of party literature . . ." Comrade Stalin described our literati as the engineers of human souls. It is necessary therefore that our literature, our literary magazines, . . . should help the Party and the people to educate the youth in the spirit of supreme devotion to the Soviet regime . . .[16]

Special attention is paid in this respect to dramatic art because of its popularity and effect. It is stated therefore that "a playwright must be a politician" and that the producer and actor must be "politicians" of the same stature. Appointment of a group of actors for a Soviet play "is a political question for the producer . . . and how the hero must be played in a Soviet play is a political question for the actor."[17] In the same manner in painting, sculpture and music the Party demands "Soviet realism" which means that the artists and the musicians must have recourse to "topical themes and images of contemporary Soviet reality" and must discard "formalistic trickery and subjectivist insularity."[18]

Accordingly any alien, especially Western, influence on Soviet thinking must be completely eliminated. Western philosophy of liberalism and free individual expression could undermine Bolshevik endeavors to create a completely regimented and submissive "new man." Hence a crusade against "cosmopolitanism, objectivism and other manifestations of bourgeois ideology"[19] has been initiated together with the severance of all closer contacts of Soviet intellectuals with the Western world.[20]

Such policies of complete subordination of one's thoughts, feelings and behavior to the needs of the Party demand not only strict censorship of all published matter[21] but dictate even the use of statistics to suit the objectives of the ruling class. A ruling

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

There is also a deliberate policy on the part of the ruling class
177 626 609 to prevent personal contact and exchange of ideas between the Soviet subjects and the foreigners. In this way the Bolshevik Party is performing the same role in the social and psychological development of Russia as the Orthodox Church has done in the past. Xenophobia and a deliberate avoidance of strangers easily develops in such circumstances, traits which have been noticed by all the observers of Soviet society. Xenophobia is so outstanding in the Soviet world that it has been noticed even by the most casual and most friendly visitors. Soviet authorities have done their best to encourage this feeling. "We were completely cut off [625] from the great bulk of the Russian people by constant police surveillance, by propaganda and by the threat of punishment."[7] "The air itself was clothed with hate and suspicion . . . penetrated even to the child world. . . . Our next door neighbours, too, were grilled, and though we had known them for years, they took to avoiding us utterly."[8] As a rule, only police informers are assigned to foreigners as servants because everyone else is afraid to work for them.

517 647 In such conditions original ideas and independent intellectual pursuits are fraught with great risks and it is often the less original, the mediocre, the cynical, the shrewd and the unscrupulous that take the lead. Some independent and creative people in such circumstances tend to become apathetic, to withdraw, to sever social contacts and put an end to their creative activities.[9] Others tend to seek safety in bureaucratic routine and in avoidance of initiative and responsibility. For each decision they tend to cover themselves by presenting the matter to various committees, or by seeking the Party's advice, thus letting others shoulder the responsibility.

517 665 The social consequences of such a development are then manifested in a pronounced anti-intellectualism, bureaucratism and vigilantism. The ascendancy of anti-intellectualistic and watchdog trends in Soviet society is well expressed, for instance, in the change in the composition of the membership of the Politbure. In this topmost ruling body the more intellectual types of revolutionaries have been gradually purged and replaced by the activists, the semi-educated professional conspirators, Party organizers, agitators and former security officials.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of the outstanding tenets in the philosophy of Russian monasticism whose history is even longer than that of the Czardom was charitable love. Many sects of the *Raskolniki* propagated and practiced principles of humaneness. The Slavophils were especially prominent in advocating the return to an idealized stateless society of benevolent paternalism where brotherhood, Christian love, and compassion would reign. The "Westerners" endeavored to introduce into Russia Western concepts of justice and tolerance, and a humanistic, libertarian and juridical state. Russian belles-lettres, Russian school textbooks, as well as laws and regulations in the nineteenth century and up to the beginning of World War I, bear witness to this trend toward Westernization and humanism.

In Soviet Russia, on the other hand, after a brief initial period of reaction against the old regime which led toward an emphasis on all-human values and equalitarian brotherhood, soon the trend of events pushed the Bolshevik ideology in the opposite direction. The determination of a ruling clique of professional conspirators to maintain themselves in power by any and all means dictated the emphasis on the internal and external "threats" which would justify the intensification of internal "measures of security," and of external aggression. Thus vigilantism and war preparedness, and expansion of internal and external Bolshevik power, became the main base of the policies of the ruling class.[25] Such policies had to be constantly reinforced by a deliberate incitement to hatred and destruction.

The image of Soviet society as being in a constant state of war, not only against foreign enemies but against internal oppositionists, deviationists, spies, saboteurs, and remnants of bourgeois mentality has been determined by a social structure which the Bolshevik rulers themselves have created, but which makes their own power uncertain and precarious. In such circumstances Lenin's idea of a life and death struggle with the "class enemies," the idea that "it's them or us" (*Kto kogo*) has provided the main motivating force of the Party's internal and foreign policies. Fearing to be annihilated unless they themselves destroy their enemies, conscious that they have "either to rule or to die," the Bolsheviks have ruthlessly applied the principle of "obedience

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

CHAPTER VII

RUSSIA

THE important fact about Russian civilization is that it is Byzantine in its origin, and that in spite of what Toynbee refers to as Russia's "fits of Westernization", its convulsions due to the injection of ideas from the West, (e.g., under Peter the Great), and again in its adoption of Marxism, Byzantine it has remained.

If anyone cares to dispute this about Russian civilization as a whole, he can hardly do so about the Russian Church in particular. In the eleventh century the Russians, or rather their Scandinavian rulers, took over Orthodoxy as one whole thing from Constantinople. It was the reverse process of what happened in the Roman Empire when the State adopted Christianity after it had largely won the people. In Russia the princes accepted Christianity and then gradually imposed it upon their subjects. Christianity had a thousand years' experience behind it, and Orthodoxy had reached its final form when Russia embraced it. No disputes about fundamental Christian doctrines disturbed the Russian Church. The Trinitarian and Christological controversies were settled, the marriage of Christian revelation with Greek philosophy had been consummated, and the conflict to settle the relations between religion and art had been fought out. Together with the liturgical books and all the external apparatus of worship, Russia took over a fixed body of doctrine, a monastic system, a style of building and ornamenting churches, and a body of legal principles.

In all these matters Russia was to introduce modifications and to set a Russian stamp upon them, for in spite of its method of adoption Orthodoxy entered into the soul of the

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

Russian people and became its very life. But the Byzantine character of Russian religion was conserved. As we have already seen the Russian Church was for long dependent upon Constantinople. Its literature consisted of translations or imitations of Byzantine writings. Its Metropolitan was a Greek consecrated in Constantinople and sent to rule the Russian Church. The two exceptions provided by the appointment in Russia of Hilarion in 1051 and Clement in 1147 are regarded as isolated cases which did not impair the theory and change the practice, which held good till 1448.

Politically the Russians lived for a century and a half under Mongol domination. From the battle of Kalka in 1223 the onslaughts of these mysterious, hideous and inhuman hordes, suddenly appearing from whence no man knew, burning, killing, capturing, had struck terror into the hearts of the dwellers on the Russian plain. Kiev, the cradle of Russian Christianity, the ancient and beautiful stronghold on the Dnieper, was sacked in 1240, and one by one the rest of the Russian towns speedily succumbed. Novgorod alone escaped, protected by its remote situation behind its marshes and forests, and by the courage, self-sacrifice and political wisdom of its prince, St. Alexander Nevsky. The Tartar rule bore less heavily upon the Church than upon the State. When their victory was assured the Tartars were at first, in matters of religion, easy-going pagans, and so long as they received their tribute, did not interfere unduly with the religion of the people they conquered. And as was also to be the case later on with the Balkan peoples under the Turk, it was their religion and their Church which, in the days of social and political disaster, saved the Russians from complete despair and preserved among them some sense of fundamental unity in spite of all their factions and divisions.

The Russian Church was the nurse of the growing national spirit of Russia. In the person of one of its great national saints, Sergius of Radonezh, who founded the Monastery of the Holy Trinity near Moscow, for centuries the citadel of Russian religion and national aspiration, it inspired the movement which thrust back the Tartar domination. In 1380 Dmitry of the Don, whose building of stone walls round Moscow had been a challenging gesture to which the Tartars were not slow

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF 1

excommunicated the Old Believers, deposed Nikon himself and banished him into monastic seclusion.

The line of Patriarchs continued until 1700 when Adrian the last of the original succession died. By this time the dynamic personality of Peter the Great had appeared on the scene and inaugurated a new period in Russian history. In building the city on the Neva which bore his own name he opened his famous "window upon Europe" through which a hurricane blew which disturbed, scattered and rearranged many things in the life of the Russians. Peter admired all things Western and was determined to make Russia a great nation after the pattern of the West. So far as the Russian Church was concerned Peter's reforms had little if any effect in the sphere of doctrine, but he saw to it that bishops were appointed who sympathized or at least were ready to co-operate with his critical ideas on traditional Russian customs and who were willing to acquiesce in the subservience of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to his own autocratic will. Most important of all, he permitted no election of a successor to the Patriarch Adrian, and twenty-one years later abolished the Patriarchate altogether. The formal instrument by which this change was made was entitled the "Ecclesiastical Regulation". There were to be no more Patriarchs in Russia, instead the supreme authority in the Church was to be vested in a body formed on the German Lutheran model and known as the Holy Governing Synod.

This was no synod in the ordinary ecclesiastical sense of the word, but a committee whose members were appointed and dismissed at the will of the Tsar. In addition a secular official called the Procurator was appointed by the Emperor. This layman was not indeed a member of the synod, but his function was to supervise all its proceedings, and without his consent the synod could enact nothing, nor even choose what matters it should discuss. The bishops were dragooned into acceptance of this system, completely foreign as it was to the spirit of the Russian Church. Yet Peter's organization lasted until the collapse of the Empire in 1917.

It is an eloquent testimony to the dynamic force of Peter's personality that the impetus of his reforming movement survived his death. But it introduced deep cleavages and

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

confusion into Russian life. The Court and governing classes in St. Petersburg became the least Russian of all sections of the nation, indeed they were more German than Russian, and for long the reform of Peter affected only the educated classes of society. Behind the St. Petersburg façade was the great mass of the people who continued to regard everything Western with suspicion and even abhorrence. Nevertheless, the movement gradually made headway and in due course the interplay of Western ideas and native Russian thought was to produce modern Russian culture and especially the astonishing achievement of Russian nineteenth-century literature.

The "Westernizers" who believed that the destiny of Russia was to follow the path of the West, and the "Slavophils" who put their faith in the Orthodox tradition of native Russian culture, sharpened their wits upon each other in drawing-room discussions and set forth their views in books. But behind all this and but little affected by it, the religious life of the Russian people went on as before. The official Church and the majority of the hierarchy supported the Government even if they disapproved of things Western. Tsar and Metropolitan needed each other, for each believed that in the preservation of the other his own well-being was involved.

But the schism inherited from the seventeenth century still continued and the "Old Believers", among whom was conserved much that was most profound and sincere in the traditional religion of Russia, would have no truck with the St. Petersburg Empire which was anathema to them, nor with the official Church which had come to terms with it. There were in course of time many groups of these interesting schismatics, some of whom had a clergy and some had not. If sections of them degenerated into sects which were psychologically abnormal, the bulk of them, consolidated by persecution and fanatically tenacious of their beliefs, upheld a high standard of conduct and their communities were a storehouse of many significant and beautiful elements of Russian Orthodoxy. Although after 1800 some availed themselves of more generous terms offered them for reconciliation to the Church, the Old Believers exist to this day as a well-organized body of some millions under their own bishops.